

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-41 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 15, 26, 34, 38, 39, 40, and 41 being the independent claims. Claim 40 is amended herein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carpenter et al. (Carpenter) U.S. Patent 6,115,804.

Independent claim 40, as amended, recites, among other features, "a means for determining whether the shared access request originates from a local node or from a remote node, wherein said local node is physically proximate to said receiving node, wherein said remote node is physically distant from said receiving node". Carpenter does not teach or suggest, among other feature, dividing the nodes in the system into a local node and a remote node based on physical proximity to a receiving node. Rather, Carpenter purports to teach that any node in the system other than the node where a particular datum is stored is considered remote with respect to that datum (Col. 4 lines 46-50). For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 40 is patentable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the current rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 26, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimmel et al. (Kimmel) U.S. Patent 5,713,004 in view of Carpenter et al. (Carpenter) U.S. Patent 6,115, 804. In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 27, 28, and 31-33 as being dependent upon a rejected claim. Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments, but, for the reasons set forth herein, respectfully disagree.

The Examiner stated that "Carpenter discloses transmitting an intervention request to other of the first and the second shared access requestor in a distributed shared memory (DSM) (col. 3 lines 5-10, cache to cache transfers) for the purpose of improving data access time by eliminating data access through much slower main memory". Applicants respectfully assert that the intervention request as taught by Carpenter (col. 3 lines 5-10, col. 8 lines 47-51) is not an equivalent operation to the invalidate instruction recited in element (4) of claim 26. In fact, as taught by Carpenter, the intervention request, when received by a node, is a signal that some other node in the system is requesting data from a cache line that the receiving node has. This is clearly different than the invalidate instruction recited in element (4) of claim 26 which, when received by a node, is a signal that some other node has modified memory data that said node has in its cache. Moreover, while the intervention request of Carpenter is followed by the receiving node sourcing the requested data from its cache to the requestor node, the invalidate instruction of the present invention is followed by the receiving node discarding its copy of the modified memory data from its cache.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Kimmel in combination with Carpenter does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 26. Furthermore, since claims 27-33 depend from claim 26, Kimmel in combination with Carpenter does not teach or suggest each and every feature of those claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections and objections to claims 26-33 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Patrick E. Garrett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,987

Date: 9/3/04

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600